

The Rules of Reading

Review of Book, Review Author, Publisher and Finance

Question Everything, Learn Something, Answer Nothing: Euripides

Always Question everything for you never know what answers you will Find.

Always Questions everything. Use 5W and 1H

*“Everything was done to try and learn how to become a better basketball player. Everything. So when you have the point of view then literally the world becomes your library to help you become better at your craft... because you know what you want the world is giving you the information 100% because you know what you’re looking for.” **Kobe Bryant***

Once you know what it is in life that you want to do, then the world basically becomes your library. Everything you view, you can view from that perspective, which makes everything a learning asset for you.

Never Take Shortcuts that affect negatively my work quality. Take shortcuts that increase productivity, but not affect my work Quality.

Volume 23

Do Fewer Things: *Prioritize a limited number of significant tasks to reduce overload and enhance focus.*

Work at a Natural Pace: *Align your work rhythm with natural cycles, avoiding the pitfalls of constant urgency.*

Obsess Over Quality: *Commit to excellence in your endeavors, even if it means*

Cal Newport

Prefer to Do Your Own Research, rather ask Artificial Intelligence (AI). Artificial intelligence can be useful for Geographical facts. But, when it comes to serious research, you should not use it. If you are not expert on the topic, then simply do not comment without proper Research. **William Lane Craig**

Brain Like Muscle, The Harder You Use, The Stronger it Becomes.

"If You Don't Read Newspaper You are uninformed. If You Do Read It You Are Misinformed. What are the Responsibilities The Reporter Has? The Responsibility Of Reporter Is To Tell The Truth, Not Just To Be First, But To Tell The Truth. We Living In The Society, Where Just First Is Priority, who Cares, Just Get It Out There, Do Not Care Who Would It Hurts, Do Not Care Who Would Destroy, Do Not Care If It Is True, Just Say It And Sell It." **Denzel Washington**

If you want your name to be remembered after your death, either do things worth writing, or write things worth reading." **Benjamin Franklin.**

If You Don't Produce You Won't Thrive – No Matter How Skilled Or Talented You Are. Human beings, it seems, are at their best when immersed deeply in something challenging. If you service low-impact activities, therefore, you're taking away time you could be spending on higher-impact activities. Two Core Abilities for Thriving in the New Economy

- *The ability to quickly master hard things.*
- *The ability to produce at an elite level, in terms of both quality and speed.*

Cal Newport.

Table of Content

Part 1 Review of The Book	4
Part 2 Analyzing Author, Publisher and Audience	9
Part 3 Good Science vs Bad Science	12
Part 4 Content Of Critical Review	15
Part 5 Funding	17

Part 1- Review Of The Book

Review Of The Book

- A. Read or listen 25min and 5min break
 - Read or Listen 20 pages an Hour according Mortimer Adler
- B. Read or Listen between 1-50 times the book
- C. Speed of Audiobook
 - Analysing audiobook listen between 75 words per minute to 285 words per minute or listen between 0.5-1.9 times speed
- D. What is the: title, author, publisher, date, length, and ISBN
- E. Highlight any notable aspects, good or bad, of the book's design and production. Consider aesthetics, typography, cover, design, images, table of contents, notes, references, index.
- F. What qualifies the author to write this book?
- G. Does the book deliver on its promise? (What does it promise? What does it deliver? Cite evidence.)
- H. What is the Style (casual, formal, light, humours, serious, scholarly . . .), point of view
- I. What audience am I writing for? Consider where your review will be published. Who will be reading it, and what will they want to know about a book before buying it? Put yourself in the perspective of the intended audience, even if you are not a part of it.
- J. Who is the audience? (i.e. age, reading level, interests, specialties...)
- K. What genres/sub-genres does this fit into? Define the primary genre, then find elements of other sub-genres that may not have been immediately identifiable.
- L. For nonfiction books what is your assessment of the quality of the argument, evidence, and exposition?
 - Is the book intellectually honest?
- M. What, if anything, is the original contribution this book makes?
- N. What did you learn? What insights did you gain? Does the book make a unique contribution to knowledge or wisdom? Does it provide a new and better way to present difficult material?

- O. What surprised you? Did you ever have an **ah-ha moment** while reading the book?
- P. Was it easy or difficult to read? Fun and rewarding to read?
- Q. For a fiction book, consider: Did you get lost in the book? What are the salient **plot points**? Did the book achieve emotional entrainment? Was the character development intriguing? Did you care about the characters?
- R. Which part attracts you most? Which ones were boring? Which chapter is the key-point of the story? Which portions did you like most? Why?
- S. Does The Book, Text, Debate, Discussion, Speech tries to use Sneaky technique to take away the audience's attention from something more important at that time?
- T. Does The Book, Text, Debate, Discussion, Speech tries to use Sneaky technique to take away the audience's attention from something more important?
- U. Does The author, Writer, Speaker tries to use Sneaky technique to take away the audience's attention from something more important?
- V. What is your favourite quote from the book? Why?
- W. What creative value does this book contribute?
- X. How does this book affect you on the whole? How does the author achieve this?
- Y. How does each role affect the story?
- Z. What is missing?
- AA. Does the book sparkle? A book that sparkles is fun to read, breaks new ground, communicates in memorable ways, uses images effectively, is accessible to a broad audience, and influences a significant readership to change their assumptions, beliefs, or ways of thinking.
- BB. Judge the book. Is it good or bad? Why?
- CC. Who are your target readers for your review? Are you writing this review to serve someone? Is your review outstanding among all the reviews of this book?
- DD. What, if anything, makes this an important work? What does the reader stand to gain by reading this book?
- EE. Book Style
- Reading level, vocabulary, sentence length.
 - **Point of view** (omniscient narrator, first person, . . .)
 - Serious, satire, humorous, academic, pedantic, frivolous

- Comforting, call to action, alarming, disturbing,
- FF. Was I confused at any point while reading? If the writing was unclear, note this. If you didn't understand it, other readers probably won't either.
- GG. Did I care about the characters? If the characters weren't compelling in the slightest, the story likely fell flat. If you noticed this, include it in your review. (This is primarily a consideration in fiction and memoir.)
- HH. Did it have a compelling plot? Without a compelling plot, any work involving a storyline will lose the reader's attention. If you got bored, make it clear in your review.
- II. Was the dialogue believable? If it was difficult to believe anyone would talk like the characters in the book, the characters themselves were probably difficult to imagine.
- JJ. Were the events believable? At its core, a book (unless purely informational) is a story. If a story fails to be credible, the book cannot succeed at being a book.
- KK. Did any quotes strike me? Was anything said that you found interesting, thought-provoking, or tear-jerking? Note these strong moments in your review! (If this quote spoils a surprise moment in the book, include a warning at the beginning of your review.)
- LL. Was there any information I thought to be inaccurate? Credibility is important in any genre. If one piece of false information is presented, readers will lose trust in the entire book.
- MM. Are the illustrations engaging? If it includes illustrations, note if they are eye-catching or bland. Pay special attention to this if you are reviewing a children's book.
- NN. Is there any questionable/profane/graphic content? Many readers want to be aware of this kind of content before picking up a book. Even if it doesn't bother you, note anything that may be questionable to other readers.
- OO. What is the author's voice like? Describe how the author approaches the reader. Is the tone comedic, conversational, professional, or aloof?
- PP. **Tone** is the feeling that a book evokes in the reader. In many cases, this category best answers the question, "What are you in the mood for?" A more extensive list

of tone descriptors and a brief definition of each is available in the above reference.

- Humorous, solemn, distant, intimate, ironic, arrogant, condescending, authoritative, scholarly, sentimental, angry, melancholy, anguished, youthful, optimistic, deadpan, satirical, maudlin, self-righteous, and so on.

QQ. What is the author's purpose? Consider why this book was written and what the author intends to convey to the audience.

RR. Book Semantics

- Credible, speculative, innovative, drivel, ...
- Informative, argumentative, entertaining, ...
- Well organised, well argued, excellent supporting evidence,
- Muddled logic, rambling
- Coherence, consistency, flow.

SS. Is the author's purpose accomplished? Now consider how the answer above came across. Was it clear, or did you have to "dig" for it?

TT. What are the author's credentials? What makes this author the only person who could write this book? Do they have a certain education or experience that makes them unique?

UU. Is there an index or bibliography? This extra material, though not necessary, is good to know about before picking up the book.

VV. What other books are similar to this one? What other titles have the same style as this one? Compare it to other books to give your audience a better idea of what it is like.

WW. What did I learn while reading? Did this book make you think more deeply about any academic or moral topics?

XX. Who would I recommend this book to? What specific audience would enjoy this book? Is it worth the time for others to read it?

YY. **Tone** is the feeling that a book evokes in the reader. In many cases, this category best answers the question, "What are you in the mood for?" A more extensive list of tone descriptors and a brief definition of each is available in the above reference.

- Humorous, solemn, distant, intimate, ironic, arrogant, condescending, authoritative, scholarly, sentimental, angry, melancholy, anguished, youthful, optimistic, deadpan, satirical, maudlin, self-righteous, and so on.

Part 2 Analyzing Author, Publisher and Audience

Analyzing Author, Publisher, and Audience

Author

1. Background and Credentials:

- What is the author's family background, history, ideology, and worldview?
- What academic credentials and level of education does the author hold?
- Does the author have relevant professional or personal experience, and is their expertise recognized by others?

2. Purpose and Research:

- Why did the author write this text, and what position do they take on the subject?
- How much research was conducted, and are the sources reliable (primary or secondary)?
- Did the author reach conclusions through careful analysis?

3. Bias and Presentation:

- Is the author impartial, or do they show bias through selective evidence, language, or focus?
- Does the author favor a specific political, organizational, or religious agenda?
- Does the author present both sides of an argument fairly or misrepresent opposing views (e.g., straw man fallacy)?

4. Tone and Technique:

- What tone does the author use—neutral, persuasive, or entertaining?
- Does the language reveal bias, strong emotion, or humor intended to influence the reader?

5. Credibility:

- Are the author's sources credible, and have they quoted or interpreted them accurately?
- Are statistics or data presented fairly, or are they biased or misrepresented?

- Does the author admit to speculation or guesswork?

6. Professional and Personal Interests:

- Is the author affiliated with organizations, think tanks, or industries that may influence their perspective?
- Has the author been compensated for endorsements, or do they have personal or professional stakes in the topic?

7. Reception and Engagement:

- Has the author responded to predecessors in their field?
- Do other experts or authors cite the writer's work?

Publisher

1. Reputation and Reliability:

- Who is the publisher or sponsor, and is it reputable?
- Is the publication edited and reviewed by respected scholars or disinterested parties?

2. Editorial Bias:

- Does the publication have political, cultural, or commercial biases that influence content?
- Does the publisher verify and protect the statements they print?

3. Quality Control:

- Is the book/article peer-reviewed or edited for accuracy?
- Are there instances of hoaxes, sabotage, or unreliable content in the publisher's history?

4. Political and Cultural Stances:

- Where does the publisher/editorial team stand on political or cultural issues, and how does this impact the material?
- What do the table of contents, advertisements, or topics suggest about the publisher's biases?

Audience

1. Intended Audience:

- Who is the primary audience—educated readers, experts, general readers, or uneducated audiences?
- Is the audience familiar with the subject matter, or is the book designed to introduce or challenge them?

2. Engagement and Response:

- Was the book written to persuade, inform, or entertain the audience?
- How has the audience responded—reviews, critiques, or scholarly discussions?
- Are reviews driven by personal agendas or accurate assessments?

3. Authenticity and Reputation:

- Is the audience real (genuine readership) or manufactured (e.g., sponsored responses)?
- Do scholars or other authors reference the work or its quotes as accurate and fair?

4. Bias and Challenge:

- Does the author challenge the audience or lead them to agree with their viewpoint?
- Are opposing views presented in a manner that is fair and unbiased?

5. Scholarly and Popular Reception:

- Is the book considered credible and fair by scholars?
- Has the book's reputation been influenced by rumors, speculation, or controversy?

Part 3 Good Science vs Bad Science

Key Concepts

1. Good Science

- Adheres to the scientific method, which involves forming a hypothesis, gathering evidence, and testing the hypothesis through reproducible experiments.
- Relies on evidence rather than proof, recognizing the potential for discrediting or adjusting theories with new data.
- Avoids sensational claims and ensures rigorous testing.

2. Bad Science

- Follows the scientific method but is flawed by errors, biases, or insufficient evidence.
- Often conducted with good intentions but may be influenced by external incentives or poor methodology.
- Can improve through refinement and further research.

3. Pseudoscience

- Lacks any basis in the scientific method.
- Disregards evidence that contradicts claims and often uses misleading narratives.
- Relies on untestable or non-reproducible claims designed to persuade rather than inform.

Red Flags of Bad Science

1. Insufficient Sample Size

- Studies with small or non-representative samples cannot generalize findings to larger populations.

2. Lack of Peer Review

- Peer review ensures that research is scrutinized by other experts for accuracy and validity.

3. Overstated Claims

- Promises of miraculous cures or significant benefits from minimal effort should be treated with skepticism.

4. Confusion Between Correlation and Causation

- Just because two factors are correlated does not mean one causes the other.

5. Conflict of Interest

- Research funded by parties with vested interests may bias results.

6. Unreplicated Results

- Single studies are preliminary and need replication to confirm findings.

7. Flawed Methodology

- Studies that lack control groups, double-blinding, or proper statistical analysis are unreliable.

Hallmarks of Good Science

1. Published in Reputable Journals

- Reputable journals ensure studies undergo thorough peer review.

2. Conducted by Qualified Researchers

- Researchers with relevant expertise and credentials are more likely to produce reliable work.

3. Part of a Larger Body of Evidence

- Valid studies build upon or align with existing research. Meta-analyses are particularly trustworthy.

4. Transparency

- Good science discloses conflicts of interest and acknowledges limitations.

5. Reasonable Sample Size and Duration

- Large, representative samples and long-term studies yield more robust data.

6. Control Groups and Double-Blinding

- Control groups provide baselines for comparison, and blinding reduces bias.

7. Statistical Significance

- Results should demonstrate a low likelihood of being due to random chance.

8. Clear, Logical Presentation

- Well-structured, error-free research reflects attention to detail and thoroughness.

Examples

1. Power Posing

- A 2010 study suggested expansive poses could boost confidence and performance.
- Follow-up studies failed to replicate the results, revealing methodological flaws such as small sample size and self-reported data.

2. Green Coffee Beans for Weight Loss

- A 2012 study claimed weight-loss benefits, later discredited for manipulated data and lack of methodological rigor.
- The researchers had conflicts of interest, and the findings were not reproducible.

Takeaways

- Science is a continuous process of inquiry, not an immutable truth.
- Be cautious of research that overpromises or lacks evidence.
- Evaluate studies based on their adherence to scientific principles, transparency, and reproducibility.
- “Extraordinary claims require extraordinary evidence.”

Part 4 Content Of Critical Review

Content Of Critical Review

Content of Critical Review

1. Always Read Both sides of the story to come to your own conclusion.
2. The researcher needs to evaluate the research that has already been undertaken in the area of your research project,
3. Show and explain the relationship between published research findings and reference the literature in which they were reported.
4. Your review will also enable the readers to see your ideas against the background of previous published research in the area.
5. The researcher needs to be highly critical of the earlier research reported in the literature. If you want to be highly.
6. Critical the research must review the literature, explain clearly why it is problematic, and justify your own idea.
7. Considering content of critical review, the research need
 - A. To include the key academic theories within chosen area of research.
 - A. To demonstrate that your knowledge of chosen area is up to date.
 - B. Through clear referencing, enable those reading your project report to find the original publications which you cite.
 - C. The research needs to avoid plagiarism.
8. Have you ensured that the literature covered relates clearly to your research question?
9. Have you covered the most relevant and significant theories of recognised experts in the area?
10. Have you covered the most relevant and significant literature or at least a representative sample?
11. Have you included up to date literature?
12. Have you referenced all the literature used in the format prescribed in the assessment criteria?
13. What is really meant by being critical about the content
14. There are 5 aspects of critical approach that should e fostered by researcher:
 - A. Critique of rhetoric-this means appraising or evaluating a problem with effective use of language. In the context of your critical literature review, this

emphasises the need for you, as the reviewer to use your skills both of making reasoned judgements and of arguing effectively in writing.

- B. Critique of tradition.
 - C. Critique of authority.
 - D. Critique of objectivity.
15. Questioning everything you read, and be sceptic. This means you need to be consistently considering and justifying with clear arguments your own critical stance.
16. Part of the researcher judgement will inevitably mean being able to identify the most relevant and significant theories and recognised experts highlighted.
17. The researcher needs to:
- A. Refer to and assess research by recognised experts in chosen area.
 - B. Consider and discuss research that supports and research that opposes the idea.
 - C. Make reasoned judgement regarding the value of others 'research, showing clearly how it related to the topic of the research.
 - D. Justify the arguments with valid evidence in a logical manner.
 - E. Distinguish clearly between facts and opinions.
18. The researcher needs to read widely on the research topic and have good knowledge and understanding of literature.
19. The researcher needs to comment on merits and faults of key literature within the chosen area.
20. Have you shown how your research question related to previous research reviewed?
21. Have you assessed the strengths and weaknesses of the previous researched reviewed?
22. Have you been objective in your discussion and assessment of another people's research?
23. Have you included referenced to research that is counter to your own opinion?
24. Have you distinguished clearly between facts and opinions?
25. Have you make reasoned judgement about the value and relevance of others ' research to your own?
26. Have you justified clearly your own ideas?

27. Have you highlighted those areas where new research (yours) is needed to provide fresh insights and taken these into account in your arguments? In particular:
- A. Where there are inconsistencies in current knowledge and understanding?
 - B. Where there are omissions or bias in published research?
 - C. Where research findings need to be tested further?
 - D. Where evidence is lacking, inconclusive contradictory or limited?
28. Have you justified your arguments by referencing correctly published research?

Part 5 Funding

The Funding of Book, Author, Publisher, Speaker, Presenter, School, Government, Politician, Companies, Influencer, Newspaper, Journalist or Other Person.

Rule 1-Sponsor and Follow the money.

A. Who is the sponsor?

1. Watch What Sponsors Do and Not What they talk.
2. Who gave the funds? One person or group of people?
3. Why are they have been sponsored?
4. How much were they sponsored?
5. Almost at the end ask questions about the funds provided to the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, publisher and find out about the source of the funds provided. This is the outside research needs to be done. Follow the money
6. Who funded this whole scheme and situation?
7. Where the funds came from?
8. Where the funds where? Who received the funds?
9. Were these funds for influencing?
10. Were these funds for political reason?
11. Where these funds for legal reason?
12. Where these funds for lobbyism?
13. Does this type of funding influence research?
14. Follow the money and funding.
15. Research who is behind the funding; name, companies, politicians etc.
16. Who paid for this situation to occur?
17. Who sponsored this event. Situation? Show the diagram.
18. How much was it paid to the people for this event?
19. How did they paid this? Was it directly, indirectly or off shore companies, companies, charity, charity groups, other groups, people from the company?
20. What currency was it paid?
21. What other reward was at stake for these people? New job, some incentive?
22. Make a line of web who I sponsoring and who is gaining?
23. How these people related to the lobbyist or sponsor?
24. Was it use different?

25. How did the transaction happen?
26. What has been used to sponsor those people?
27. What did they do with the funds?
28. What people incentives were?

Rule 2-Corruption and follow the money

- B. What are the corruption scheme in this situation/government, company, person or group of people?
1. Ask for the full names, job titles and locations of:
 2. The persons who solicited or received the bribe and the persons or companies that paid the bribe, or offered to do so.
 3. Any agents, middlemen and subcontractors involved in the payments.
 4. Try to get as many details as possible of the alleged bribes, including:
 5. How much money was involved in the bribe payments and the overall transactions?
 6. What the bribe payments were for, for example, to be selected, to get a contract amendment, to be paid promptly, etc.?
 7. How the payments were made – by cash, wire transfer or check, or in the form of goods or services – and how the payments were recorded – for example, as a “consulting fee” or commission or miscellaneous expenses. Ask who was involved in these transactions.
 8. Try to identify the account (or at least the bank) or source of funds from which the payments were made, and the bank or accounts to which they were made.
 9. Ask about documentation of the bribe payments and the evidence corrupt influence. This could include, of course, bank account records, wire transfer receipts, or false invoices and receipts to disguise the payments. Evidence of corrupt influence could include documentation showing inflated pricing, acceptance of poor quality work, approval of unnecessary change orders, etc. Ask who has the records and where are they? Request copies. Ask for emails or other communications regarding the scheme.
 10. Get the names and location of other persons who might know of the scheme, such as former employees or competitors of the bribe payer (who also might have been approached for bribes), associates or subordinates of the bribe taker.

Rule 3-Legal VS Illegal Schemes

1. What are the corruption diagrams in this situation by government, company, person or group of people?
2. Was this legal scheme?
3. Was there any hidden in the accounting? What was hidden? What was tried to be hidden? Why was hidden?
4. What scheme did they use regarding funding?
5. Was this legal?
6. What are the schemes? Legal vs illegal? What are the evidence or proof?
7. Does this violated any law or regulations? Constitution, tax, finance economic, legal or other regulations?
8. What are the names who involved in this scheme:
 - A. Names
 - C. Addresses
 - D. Company names
 - E. Charity
 - F. Group names
 - G. Government agencies
 - H. Regulation agencies
 - I. Government bodies
 - J. Name in the government
9. How did the corruption occurred.
10. What is corruption?
11. Which countries are the most corrupt?
12. What are the common characteristics of countries with high corruption?
13. What is the magnitude of corruption? (5) Do higher wages for bureaucrats reduce corruption?
14. Can competition reduce corruption?
15. Why have there been so few (recent) successful attempts to fight corruption?
16. Does corruption adversely affect growth?
17. Do you know or suspect, or have you heard, that kickbacks are being paid?
18. Questions to identify parties and potential witnesses include:
 - A. Please identify all persons and organizations that might be involved in suspect transactions, including all:
 - I. Contractors

II. Subcontractors

III. Suppliers

IV. Agents or middlemen

V. Project or government officials

- Have any bidders filed protests or complaints or voiced suspicions?
- Are any unnecessary or questionable agents or middlemen involved in any contracts?
- Are any agents or middlemen paid unreasonably high fees?
- Do any project or government officials refer contractors to certain suppliers, subcontractors or agents?
- Questions about selection and performance include:
 - A. Are questionable selection methods, e.g., unjustified sole source awards, employed?
 - B. Do any contractors charge unreasonably high prices, which are accepted by project or government officials?
 - C. Do any contractors receive an unusually high volume of contracts?
 - D. Is the quality of any contractor's work consistently unsatisfactory, but accepted by project or government officials?
 - E. Do any contractors consistently miss delivery or completion dates without penalty?
 - F. Do any contractors receive questionable, or an unusually high number of, change orders?
- 1. Questions about the behavior of the project or government officials include:
 - A. Do any project or government officials:
 1. Give favorable treatment to certain contractors?
 2. Routinely ignore or excuse poor or late service by particular contractors?
 3. Have an unusual interest in the selection or success of a particular contractor, or in a particular contract?
 4. Take any actions with regard to certain contractors, or contracts, that are outside, or below, their normal duties?
 5. Routinely ignore standard policy and procedure to benefit a certain contractor?
- 2. Questions about the relationship between parties include:

- A. Is there close socialization or a “less than arm’s length relationship” between any contractor and project or government officials?
- B. Do any project or government officials:
 - 1. Accept inappropriate gifts, travel or entertainment from any contractors?
 - 2. Display new or unexplained wealth?
 - 3. Appear to have financial problems?
 - 4. Officials have outside business interests or companies?
- C. Have all project and government officials filed required conflict of interest and financial disclosure forms?
- 3. Questions about contract documentation include:
 - D. Do any contractors submit inflated or questionable invoices, or fail to provide adequate documentation for them?
 - E. Do any project or government officials routinely ignore or tolerate the submission of inadequate documentation by certain contractors?
 - F. Are change order requests and payments adequately documented for all contractors?
 - G. Are controls and procedures to prevent bribes and kickbacks in place and enforced?

Rule 4-Conflict of Interest

- A. Was there Conflict of interest?
 - 1. How does the Conflict of Interest occur?
 - 2. How do we know that Conflict of Interest Occurred?

Rule 4-Trust of the Source

- A. Where did the data has been found?
 - 1. Can I trust sources of the information?

Rule 5-Who is interesting in the situation

A. Watch What They Do and Not What they talk.

1. Deep State, Who is in the deep state: Names, Ages, What are their position, Where did they study, Who are they studied with, who are their parents. Where they lived.
2. Who are the Shadow People or person who controls everything in government? Names, Ages, What are their position, Where did they study, Who are they studied with? who are their parents. Where they lived.
3. Who is the CEO, CFO, Risk managers, Board of Directors, Shareholders, stakeholders of the company, Organisation? Names, Ages, What are their position, Where did they study, Who are they studied with? who are their parents. Where they lived
4. Who are the shadow CEO, CFO, Risk manager, Board of Directors, shareholders, stakeholders of the company, organisation: Names, Ages, What are their position, Where did they study, Who are they studied with, who are their parents. Where they lived.
5. Who has interest in this situation?
6. Who is the interested group or party? Do the diagram of how they are related to this situation and how they would gain out of this situation?
7. Who lobbying this?
4. Who is the person/organisation or group that this situation is the most useful?
5. Who is the person/organisation or group that this situation is least useful?
6. Did the author used all AVAILABLE SOURCES, INFORMATION, FACTS AND ARGUMENTS TO HIM/HER?
7. Does the author trying to rewrite facts, information, history of the subject to fit his/her arguments and situation?
8. Did the author do honest analysis of all available sources, information, arguments, evidence and facts?
9. Whom this situation is the most useful?
10. Whom this situation is the least useful?
11. What Capital Group is winner in this situation?
12. What Capital Group is Loser in this situation?
13. Who is the winner of this situation?
14. Who is the loser of this situation?

15. Who is the victim in this situation?
16. Who is not the victim in this situation?
17. Who is the most likely used this situation to his/her/their advantage?
18. Who is the least likely used this situation to his/her/their advantage?
19. Who got harm in this situation?
20. Who did not get harm in this situation?
21. Almost at the end ask questions about the funds provided to the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, publisher and find out about the source of the funds provided. This is the outside research needs to be done. Follow the money
22. Who or what is the most influenced in this situation?
23. What are the corruption scheme in this situation/government, company, person or group of people?
24. What are the corruption diagrams in this situation by government, company, person or group of people?
25. Who is at fault in this situation?
26. Who is not at fault in this situation?
27. Who funded this whole scheme and situation?
28. Where the funds came from?
29. Where the funds where? Who received the funds?
30. Was this legal scheme?
31. Is the current situation or crisis or breaking news is there to cover something bigger behind? Like trying to pass new laws or corruption or purchase which are illegal. What are these things that been tried to hid behind big news. Research everything?
32. Who losing the most in this situation?
33. Who is losing least in this situation?
34. Who is winning the most in this situation
35. Who is the winning least in this situation?
36. Does the person tried to incorrectly paraphrase the arguments or facts or evidence?
37. Is there conflict of interest between these two parties?
38. Who is the breaking conflict of interest?
39. Was there are any Break a law, code of, GDPR?

40. Was there any hidden in the accounting? What was hidden? What was tried to be hidden? Why was hidden?
41. What or who the person tried to protect?
42. Was there any motivation behind some of the actions?
43. What was the motivation behind these actions?
44. What are the mathematical formulas behind?
45. What are the flow chart of decision. What would be outcome if they would decide one way or the other?
46. Was the person who speaking, presenting, author, researcher representing other side correctly and honestly?
47. Was the speaker, presenter, author and researcher were paid by somebody to do the propaganda and throw the dirt on other people?
48. Was there any propaganda used in the speech, research, book or article so that they/ he/ she advising about other side incorrectly?
49. Did I use evidence, facts and sources for every argument, premise, conclusion and sentence?
50. Did the other side used sources, facts, evidence for every sentence, premise, argument and conclusion?
51. Did the analogies are correct?
52. Did the analogies really represent other side or my side?
53. What type of arguments presented by other side?
54. Was other side used epithets about other side? Was this is logical fallacy? Did I use the epithets? Did the other side understand this epithets? Why did they think this was appropriate way or time to say this? Was this what other person think? Was this objectively true or not? Was this breaking any law?
55. Does the other side understand the definition of this term?
56. Was this is a troll who is not looking to get the correct information, but troll others and me?
57. Is this person looking appropriate discussion?
58. Is this person trying to persuade you appropriately with full information which is correct or incorrect?
59. Would you apologise if provided facts and evidence were wrong for the arguments which were lead to wrong conclusion?
60. Does the person know or understand that he/she/they are wrong or right?

61. Why they they think they are right?
62. Why they think they are wrong?
63. How do we know that this happened exactly the way he said? Do we have facts?
Evidence?
64. Use **What, who, why, when, where, how, do , did, can, may do not, did not, cannot may not, might, might not, does, does not.**
65. Does the person has the education to speak about this subject.
66. Does the person has honestly went through the criticism of the opposing ideas?
Did the person found the reason he opposing to the other person?
67. Does the person have serious intention to confuse audience?
68. How well does the person do the job to confuse the audience?
69. Did the person introduced new terms or arguments.
70. Did the other person did a good job to research his her ideas and opposing
person ideas?
71. What is the reason the person trying to confuse audience?
72. What propaganda tools did the author, speaker, writer used in analysing this idea
and opposing person idea?
73. Did the person understood or understand that he used propaganda tools.
74. What sources did the other person used in analysing opposing person
arguments?

Rule 6-Complaint

- A. The full names, job titles and contact information for all persons and organizations allegedly involved.
- B. The details (who, what, when, where, why and how much) of the allegations.
- C. The dates or time period of the key events.
- D. How much money or losses are involved.
- E. Are there any records or documents that support the allegations? If so, what and who has them? Ask for electronic and paper copies.
- F. The names, location and contact information of other persons who might know of the wrongdoing and be willing to discuss it.
- G. Are there other similar transactions? If so, get the details, and find out who knows about them.
- H. How does the complainant know about the allegations? If from other persons, who and where are they?
- I. Is the scheme currently on-going? If so, do the subject(s) know of the complainant's report? (This helps to determine whether a covert investigation would be feasible.)
- J. Will the complainant agree to testify or sign a statement? (Many will not, but their information is still useful to identify leads, documents and other witnesses who will testify. Assure the witness that he or she will not be compelled to testify if unwilling to do so.)
- K. What is the complainant's motive to report? (In most cases, the complainant's motive is not as important as his or her credibility.)
- L. Try to determine if there is any reason to suspect the complainant's credibility, such as a personal interest in the transactions, a history of disputes between the parties or a criminal record.

Rule 7-Power in Society

1. Who has the power in society?
2. Watch What Sponsors Do and Not What they talk.
3. List of the groups, companies government who has the power in society?
4. Why do I think this group has the power in the society?
5. Who is the shadow controlling?
6. Who is shadow government?
7. Who is in the control behind?
8. Make a list of the groups who control behind?
9. Why do I think this group is in control?

Rule 8-Why author choose these facts

1. Why the author choose these facts?
2. Why author choose these figures?
3. Why author choose these evidences?
4. Does these facts or facts or evidence make stronger the argument or weaken?

Rule 9-Rewrite History

1. Does the author, presenter, speaker tries to rewrite the history or story?
2. Why does the author, presenter, speaker tries to rewrite the history or story?
3. What facts does the author hides or suppress to rewrite the history?
4. What is the reason of the author, presenter, speaker tries to rewrite the history or story?

Rule 10-Dividing groups into smaller groups

1. Does the author, presenter, speaker tried to divide the nation or the group into different groups? What are the groups the author, presenter or speaker tries to divide the people? Make a list
2. How is the author, presenter and speaker tries to divide the group of people?
3. Does the author tries to set up each group against each other? Why do the author tries to set up two groups against each other?

4. Does the author or presenter or speaker tries to segregate the people? Into what groups does the author, speaker, presenter tries to segregate the people into?
5. What is the reason does the author, presenter or speaker tries to divide and segregate people into? Is there any motivation?

Rule 11-Affiliating with Political party

1. Does the presenter or speaker or author affiliate to one of the political party?
What party does the author, speaker presenter belongs to?
2. Why is the author belongs to the party?
3. Why is the author not belong to the party?

Rule 12-Affiliating with organisation

1. Does the author, presenter or speaker belongs to the organisation? What organisation does the author, presenter or speaker belongs to?
2. What does the organisation doing? How they try to influence the world?

Rule 13-Influence the world

1. Does the author, presenter, speaker tries to influence the world?
2. How does the author , presenter, speaker tries to influence the world?
3. What way does the author, presenter, speaker tries to influence the world?
4. Why does the author, presenter, speaker tries to influence the world? To gain political, military, financial power? What other power does the author, presenter, speaker tries to gain?

Rule 13-Does the author tries to provoke?

1. Does the author, speaker, presenter tries to provoke some sort of disruption?
2. Why are the reason of this provoked disruption?

Rule 15-Influence with mass media

1. Does the shadow government tries to influence people through the mass media?
2. Who is sponsoring mass media?
3. How they are trying to influence through mass media?
4. What reforms does the shadow government tries to pass in order to satisfy shadow government

Rule 16-Destroy

A. Is anybody tries to destroy the foundation of the following:

- Government
- Mass media
- Family
- Nation
- Institution
- Education
- Moral
- Ethics
- Etc

1. Who are trying to destroy the foundation?
2. Why are they trying?
3. How are they trying?
4. What are they doing to destroy?

Rule 17-Ethical vs Unethical Manner

1. Did the author used the details in ethical manner?
2. Did the author or presenter used the research in ethical manner?
3. Was there unethical behaviour with the research and the sources?

Rule 18-Impact Others

1. How does this situation impact others?
2. How does the speech, writing, presentation impact others?
3. Why is this impact others?
4. What are the reasons that this would or is impacting others?
5. Global impact of the author, presenter, speaker, writer, situation to other.
6. Geopolitical impact analysis.
7. Why is this impact on the other people.
8. Who will this be impacted?
9. How this research impact others?
10. Make a list who will be impacted
11. Make a mind map how they will be impacted.

Rule 19-Lie

1. Where does the author, researcher, writer, presenter and speaker lying ?
2. Is this intentional lying or accidental?
3. Who this lie will impact?
4. What this lie impact?
5. What are the reason of this lie?
6. Why do I think this is lie?

Rule 20-Information and knowledge Fit

1. How this piece in the world of knowledge?
2. How this will impact the world and other people?
3. How does the information fit with each other?
4. How does the information relation with each other?
5. How does the information fit with each other in the world.
6. How does the information relation with each other in the world?

Rule 21-Interested party and groups in Narrative

- A.** What interested party has the most interest in this narrative??
- B.** What interested party has the least interest in this narrative?
- C.** What interest party controls this narrative?
- D.** Is this narrative based on truth or lie?
- E.** Why is this narrative is based on truth?
- F.** Why is this narrative is based on Lie?
- G.** Why author, speaker, researcher, journalist, presenter lying to the audience?
- H.** Why author, speaker, researcher, journalist, presenter telling truth to the audience?
- I.** What is the reason of this lie?
- J.** What is the reason of this truth?
- K.** What narrative does the author, researcher, speaker, journalist, presenter trying to push? Why is this? What is the reason?
- L.** What narrative does the author, researcher speaker, journalist, presenter tries to represent? What is the reason? Why?
- M.** Is this narrative has strategic point, target? Why?
- N.** Why does the author says the truth? What is it up to? Is this strategic decision to tell a truth? Does the author tries to do moral, ethical or strategic? Is this selective or not?
- O.** Why does the author says the Lie? What is it up to? Is this strategic decision to tell a Lie? Does the author tries to do moral, ethical or strategic? Is this selective or not?
- P.** What group or interested party does the author represent? What is the reason and why?
- Q.** What worldview does the author, researcher, speaker, journalist, present trying to create with this lie or truth?
- R.** What are they trying to achieve with this lied or truthful narrative?
- S.** What are they trying to achieve by lie or truth? What end of result they are trying to achieve?
- T.** Has the author, representer, presenter, researcher, speaker trying to wash out themselves by using lie or truth?

- U.** Does the author, representative, presenter, researcher, speaker tries to wash out the interested group or party by showing how good is this party is?
- V.** Does the author use selective narrative in representation of the worldview?
- W.** Make a list of following”

10. How many truth statements made

- I. How many truth facts made
- II. How many lie statements made
- III. How many lie facts made
- IV. What conclusion can we make out of this

Rule 22-Tools author, presenter, writer, researcher, speaker representative used

1. Why do the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative use emotional tools to persuade audience? What emotional tools used?
2. Why do the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative use psychological tools to persuade audience? What tools do they use?
3. What are the performing arts tools?
4. What are the visual arts tools?
5. What are history tools?
6. What are language tools
7. What are linguistic and literature tools?
8. What are Law tools?
11. What are philosophy tools?
12. What are theology tools?
13. What are anthropology tools?
14. What are archeology tools?
15. What are economical tools?
16. what are geography tools?
17. What are political science tools?
18. What are psychology tools?
19. What are sociology tools?
20. What are social work tools?
21. What are biology tools?
22. What are chemistry tools?
23. What are earth science tools?
24. What are space science tools?
25. What are physics tools?
26. What are computer science tools?
27. What are mathematics tools?
28. What are agriculture tools?
29. What are architecture and design tools?
30. What are business tools?
31. What are divinity tools?

32. What are education tools?
33. What are engineering tools?
34. What are technological tools?
35. What are environmental and forestry tools?
36. What are family and consumer science tools?
37. What are human physical performance and recreation tools?
38. What are journalism tools?
39. What are media studies and communication tools?
40. What are library and museum studies?
41. What are medicine and health tools?
42. What are military science tools?
43. What are public administration tools?
44. What are social work tools?
45. What are transportation tools?
46. What are financial tools?
47. What are managerial tools?
48. What are the accounting tools?
49. What are financial advisor tools?
50. What are the financial analyst tools?

Rule 23-Did the author, writer, representative, speaker, researcher talked with both sides?

- A.** Follow the money.
- B.** History Tends to repeat. Always try to understand historical facts and build on that understanding of the history.
- C.** Do not fear objective facts and evidence, even if the facts goes against your arguments, which then you drop if goes against the facts. This helps to understand the context, narrative and see who is manipulating those facts and lying. This helps to understand how the world works and how different things has happened and what history tells you overall. When you know the truth it helps to move on. The truth shall set you free. Always investigate both sides and try to understand their facts, arguments, evidence, who is lying, manipulating, why they do this, who is behind this, what is their purpose, what are they gain from this. Check people background, family history. Do the research always yourself, listen both sides and see the objective facts, how they presenting, why they presenting. Never manipulate information, facts, evidence, and Numbers.
- D.** Watch What They Do and Not What they talk.
- E.** Do the diagram how it relates to each other
- F.** Why has author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative decide to take this topic or theme to analyse, investigate, talk, write, report, present?
- G.** Does the author is related to one of the side? Does the author will take one side or both sides to analyse the situation?
- H.** Does the author talk to one side or both sides to analyse the situation?
- I.** Does the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative do this investigation to push agenda, narrative or story to one side or the other? Is the author objectively allow both sides to speak and present both sides of the story to get full picture?
- J.** Does the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative try to deceive audience? What method does she, he use to deceive?
- K.** Is the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative selective or being selective in:
 - I.** Presenting sides
 - I.** Presenting facts

- II. Presenting Historical Facts
- III. Presenting evidence
- IV. Presenting argument.

Rule 24-Did the author, writer, representative, speaker, researcher selective and non selective information of the story?

- A. Why is the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative is so selective or non-selective in the story?
- B. Does the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative use propaganda in this investigation?
- C. Does the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative break law in this investigation?
- D. Does the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, representative tries to make:
 - A. Emotional conclusion
 - B. Deceiving conclusion
 - C. Not fully informative conclusion
 - D. Informative conclusion
 - E. Truthful conclusion
 - F. Brainwashed conclusion
 - G. Propoganda conclusion
 - H. Selective conclusion
 - I. Realistic conclusion
 - J. Wrong conclusion

Rule 25-Did the author, writer, representative, speaker, researcher manipulating information?

- A.** Who is manipulating information?
- B.** Who is manipulating facts?
- C.** Who is manipulating people to behave one way or the other?
- D.** Who is manipulating people do this is sort of things?
- E.** By changing the law, whom this will be most useful and valued?
- F.** What interested group this will be most useful and whom this will be least useful and valued?
- G.** By introducing new tax or add more tax and citizens needs to pay more for tax, whom this tax reform or add tax is most useful or valued?
- H.** Who would win in this situation?
- I.** What interested group this tax reform is least useful? Who will loose in this situation? What interested group this tax is least valued?
- J.** What interest group this politician, scientist, author, speaker, government official, military official or other group of people represent?
- K.** How much does get for this representation? Any gift, money other type of reward?
- L.** Is this politician, scientist, military official, government official or other group of people corrupt? Why do I think he, she corrupt? Why do I think he, she is not corrupt? What are the facts, evidence and arguments
- M.** When presented the story or narrative or article or research, does one side:
 - I.** Make deceitful comments about other side? Does one side misrepresent the other side? Does both side provide full truthful, deceitful information? What was deceitful, truthful
 - II.** What signs show that they told truth, deceive.
 - III.** Facts
 - IV.** Dates
 - V.** Body language

- VI. Eyes
- VII. The way they said
- VIII. Emotions
- IX. Behavior

Rule 26-Did the author, writer, representative, speaker, researcher representing interested party or group

1. What interested party does the writer, author, researcher, speaker, representative represent
2. Does this conflict of interest?
 - A. Does the author, writer, researcher, speaker representative presents both sides?
 - I. Why they represent this specific interested party or group
 - II. Do they get paid?
 - III. Who financed?
 - IV. What figure or people behind this
 - V. Follow the money?
 - VI. Follow the people or main player or figure behind the money
 - A. Follow power and the main figure or player behind all of this power? Why are they in-charge?
 - B. What is their end place or target and what is their end result?
 - C. Why are they going there?
 - D. What is the reason?
 - E. What is their psychological portrait?
 - F. What psychological issues do they have?

Rule 27-Who is behind the Chaos?

1. Who sponsor-what amount?
2. Why they sponsor?
3. Who are interested party or groups
4. Who are the main figure behind sponsoring?
5. Who are the minor figure behind sponsoring
6. Who are the main and minor figures in the group?
7. What end result do the sponsor wants?
8. What end result do the group wants?
9. Why is this end result?
10. Who behind those people?
11. Who is the shot caller
12. Is this group organised or not?
13. Who is the people power?
14. Do they want more power?
15. Do they do for the power grab?
16. Are they for money, power or both or good cause or greed?
17. What is in their heart
18. What is the main problem? Is it sin and depravity?

Rule 27a-Who is Shadow Government Like, Blackrock, Vanguard, State Street, other Banks, Asset Management etc?**Rule 27b-Who is the shadow person?**

Rule 28-Deceiving, truth and Lie

1. Does the author, researcher, speaker, writer, representative intentionally or unintentionally deceiving the author?
 - I. What is up to author, researcher, speaker, writer, representative and what does she, he receives?
 - II. What does she, he received? Money or other reward?
 - III. Does the author, researcher, speaker, writer, representative receives some smaller sentence?
 - IV. Does she, he believes what himself, herself saying?
 - V. Does the author, researcher, speaker, writer, representative says because of reward?
 - VI. Is thus the best what author can provide? In regard facts, arguments, dates, people, other information?
1. How do we know that this is true or lie? Based on what?
2. Do we have witness?
3. Do the witness tell a lie?
4. Do the witness tell a truth?
5. How do we know that the witness tell the truth or lie? What are evidence of lie or truth?
6. What is the reason of lie or truth?
7. What do they gain or loose by tell truth or lie?
8. Does the witness use selective info to present? Why does the witness do?
9. Does author, writer, researcher, speaker representative use selective information to present the argument case for? What info does the author did not include which would reduce strength of argument or case?
10. Does the author represent on side? Why? What are reason does the author suppress other side?
11. Does the author represent both sides equally? Why? What reason? If not, why not?

Rule 29-Definition change

1. Was there definition changed to fit the narrative of corporation, group of interested people, government, elite or somebody else?
2. When was changed?
3. Was there theory changed to fit narrative corporation, group of interested people, government, elite or somebody else?

Rule 30-Interested groups

1. How this information being used by newspaper, interested groups, oligarchs and other groups of people
2. What information is being useful for ideological, religious, political, cultural, financial or other agenda?
3. Is this information is pressure to censor freedom of speech, movement one or the other groups?
4. Who funded this person, newspaper, speaker, groups of people or interested groups?
5. What is the reason they have funded these groups?
6. What is their agenda by funded these groups?
7. At what angle the author, newspaper or interested groups showing this information? Why they have showed at this angle and why?
8. Does the author, speaker or interested group do what she, he, they talked? How did they show this? How they did not show this?
9. Does the character does what she, he, they said they will do?
10. What is the ideological, political, cultural, financial, religious agenda of the interested party or groups?
11. Did the author selected who she/they will present the information first?
12. Did the author selected newspaper, journalists or group of interested people who will be presented this information for some sort of agenda?
13. Why did she, he, they choose this group of people to reveal information? What is the person agenda? What is the group interested agenda?
14. What are the interested groups? Make a list of the interested groups? What are the signs and features of those particular groups
15. Does the author, speaker, journalist, activist, writer, academic belongs to one of the interested group?

16. Does the audience belong to the particular groups? What are the signs and features of particular group?
17. Follow the money? Where does the money flow from? What group of interested are funding? Do the interested group hide the money and secretly fund those groups?
18. What are the list of interested groups are ruling?
19. What are the capital groups? Who do they fund? What groups do they fund? Make a list. Why do they fund these groups? Make a list of reasons
20. Is there any trolls? What are their agenda? Who do they belong to? What group do they represent? Are they paid trolls? What country, city, age, education, marital status? How much do they receive from this work?
21. Was the information manipulated or twisted to fit the narrative of one of the interested groups? What capital group this group belongs?
22. What group this situation is the most useful? Make a list of interest groups
23. What group this situation is the least useful? Make a list of interest groups

Rule 31-List of Interested groups and parties

1. Watch What They Do and Not What they talk.
2. What is the current political, government ruling? Dictatorship, democratic, communism, socialism, monarchism, authoritarian, Oligarchy, aristocracy, theocracy, colonialism, totalitarianism, military dictatorship, anarchy, confederation, unitary state, federation, autocracy, democracy, direct democracy, electoracy, liberal democracy, liquid democracy, representative democracy, social democracy, soviet democracy, totalitarian democracy
3. Abortion
4. Agriculture and Food
5. Animals and wildlife
6. Arts
7. Entertainment
8. History
9. Budget
10. Spending
11. taxes

12. Business and consumers
13. Corporations
14. Capital
15. Campaign finance
16. Civil Liberties
17. Civil Rights
18. Constitution
19. Criminal Justice and death penalty
20. Defence and military.
21. Military industry Complex
22. Biggest Companies
23. Asset Management Companies
24. Drug and cartels
25. Economy, and fiscal
26. Education
27. Election
28. Employment and affirmative action
29. Entitlement and safety net
30. Family
31. Federal relation
32. State and local relations
33. Banking and finance and wall street
34. Fiscally conservative
35. Fiscally liberal
36. Food processing and sakes
37. Financial capital
38. Wall Street
39. economic interests
40. cause groups
41. public interests
42. private and public institutional interests
43. Political power in the political system
44. Non-associational groups and interests.

45. government policy makers and well-financed as prime movers in interest-group activity and policy making
46. Neo-corporatism
47. Corporatism and corporation
48. Lobbyist and tactics
49. Multinational corporation
50. Transnational corporation
51. Global corporation
52. Groups that have capital
53. Religious groups
54. Sects
55. Occults
56. Worship groups
57. Foreign affair
58. Foreign countries
59. Foreign aid
60. Gambling and gaming industry
61. Government budget and spending
62. Political party
63. lobbyist
64. Government operation
65. Guns
66. Health and health care
67. Big Pharma
68. Scientist
69. Insurance
70. Health insurance
71. Housing and property
72. Higher education
73. Immigration
74. Indigenous people
75. Infrastructure
76. Judicial branch
77. Courts

- 78. Solicitor and judges
- 79. K-12 Education
- 80. Infrastructure
- 81. Labor union
- 82. Union groups
- 83. legal
- 84. Legislative branch
- 85. Politician
- 86. Liberal
- 87. Marijuana
- 88. Marriage
- 89. Military and militarization groups
- 90. Minors and children
- 91. National security
- 92. Natural Resources
- 93. Oil and Gas industries
- 94. Religion
- 95. Reproduction
- 96. Science and research and academy and universities
- 97. Senior citizens
- 98. LGBT
- 99. SOCIAL
- 100. SOCIALLY CONSERVATIVE
- 101. Socially liberal
- 102. Taxes
- 103. Technology, social media communication
- 104. Mass media and communication
- 105. Taxes
- 106. Trade union
- 107. Trade
- 108. Transportation
- 109. Unemployment and low income
- 110. Veterans
- 111. Woman and man

- 112. Any other interested groups are out there?
- 113. Suppliers
- 114. Customers
- 115. Partners
- 116. Employees
- 117. Investors
- 118. Owners
- 119. Bankers
- 120. Regulatory bodies
- 121. Unions
- 122. Competitors
- 123. Society
- 124. Opposing pressure groups

4. Internal interested party examples:

1. Management

- I. Employees
- II. Corporate
- III. Owners

2. External interested party examples:

A. Customers

- I. Suppliers
- II. Community
- III. Bankers
- IV. Investors
- Regulators
- V. Unions
- VI. Trade Associations
- VII. Utilities

- VIII. Law Enforcement
- IX. Society
- X. Intellectual Property Owners
- XI. Joint Venture Partners
- XII. Business Partners
- XIII. Emergency Responders
- XIV. Industry Groups
- XV. Special Interest Groups
- XVI. News Media
- XVII. Competitors
- XVIII. Consider these *six market categories* when identifying interested parties:

- 3. Customer: buyers, consumers, clients, end users, and retailers.
- 4. Supplier: producers, vendors, contractors, and distributors.
- 5. Intermediary: referral sources, connectors, agencies, and networks.
- 6. Influencer: financial markets, regulatory markets, and government.
- 7. Internal: employees, staff, managers, and business units
- 8. Alliance: joint ventures and business partners
- 9. **Responsibility** – investors, etc.
- 10. **Influence** – pressure groups, etc.
- 11. **Proximity** – neighbours, etc.
- 12. **Dependency** – employees, etc.
- 13. **Representation** – trade unions, etc.
- 14. **Authority** – regulators, etc
- 15. Foreign [governments](#) and [international organizations](#). Countries maintain a wide array of embassies and consulates in foreign countries, and they often use these and hired lobbyists to work for such benefits as [foreign aid](#) and military support, as well as to boost the country's image abroad. International organizations (e.g., [UNESCO](#), [Asia-Pacific Economic Cooperation](#), the [Arab League](#), and

the [Organization of American States](#)) use their resources in manners similar to governments.

16. [Multinational corporations](#) (e.g., [McDonald's](#), [Coca-Cola](#), [Honda](#), [Volvo](#), and) and business trade associations (e.g., the International Chamber of Commerce and the European Association of Manufacturers of Business Machines and Information Technology). These often have extensive global or regional reach. Their major concerns in lobbying relate to similar issues that they have within individual countries and include ensuring favourable labour codes and tax structures, making trade as free as possible, ensuring favourable laws regarding government regulation of their product (e.g., food and drink) or service (e.g., telecommunications), and trying to minimize added costs such as those involving environmental regulations. Because of their extensive resources and the fact that the government relies on the economic advantages provided by these multinational corporations, they are often successful in achieving their lobbying goals.
17. Special interest and [cause groups](#). These include the [World Council of Churches](#), the [Baptist World Alliance](#), the [Anglican Communion](#), international networks of LGBTQ-rights groups, and the Inuit Circumpolar Conference, an organization of indigenous peoples of the Arctic and subarctic regions of [North America](#), Europe, and Asia. Such groups and organizations are involved in international lobbying for a variety of reasons and with mixed success. Some, such as churches, often lobby simply for the right to operate in a country and on behalf of human and [civil rights](#) and the poor. Others, such as indigenous groups, lobby for the rights of their compatriots in terms of preserving their customs and language and repatriating artifacts that may have been taken to other countries and are now housed in museums around the world (particularly in countries that were former colonizers).
18. International public interest groups ([nongovernmental organizations](#) [NGOs]). NGOs embrace a wide range of groups that focus on issues of broad public

concern, such as human rights, [child welfare](#), and the status of women, as opposed to the specific interests of particular businesses or sectors of society, such as automobile manufacturers and physicians. At the meeting in 1945 in [San Francisco](#) that drew up the UN charter, some 1,200 NGOs were in attendance. Though there is no current, reliable count of NGOs, they mushroomed in the period after World War II and may number as many as 10,000; in [Latin America](#) alone it is estimated that there are some 2,000 NGOs, many of which work in several countries. Significant among the multitude of NGOs operating in world politics today are [Human Rights Watch](#), [Oxfam International](#), [CARE](#), [Greenpeace](#), the [World Wide Fund for Nature](#), and the [Women's International League for Peace and Freedom](#). NGOs enjoy mixed success in their political activities, partly because governments rarely rely on these groups to maintain themselves in office. Most operate far from public view, and their successes may receive little publicity. Some, however, such as Greenpeace, receive major publicity for their campaigns.

Rule 32- Who Will Use This Situation

1. Who is the person/organisation or group that this situation is the most useful?
2. Who is the person/organisation or group that this situation is least useful?
3. Did the author used all AVAILABLE SOURCES, INFORMATION, FACTS AND ARGUMENTS TO HIM/HER.
4. Does the author trying to rewrite facts, information, history of the subject to fit his/her arguments and situation?
5. Did the author do honest analysis of all available sources, information, arguments, evidence and facts?
6. Whom this situation is the most useful?
7. Whom this situation is the least useful?
8. Who is the winner of this situation?
9. Who is the loser of this situation?
10. Who is the victim in this situation?
11. Who is not the victim in this situation?
12. Who is the most likely used this situation to his/her/their advantage?
13. Who is the least likely used this situation to his/her/their advantage?
14. Who got harm in this situation?
15. Who did not get harm in this situation?
16. Almost at the end ask questions about the funds provided to the author, presenter, researcher, speaker, publisher and find out about the source of the funds provided. This is the outside research needs to be done. Follow the money.
17. Who or what is the most influenced in this situation?
18. What are the corruption scheme in this situation/government, company, person or group of people?
19. What are the corruption diagrams in this situation by government, company, person or group of people?
20. Who is at fault in this situation?
21. Who is not at fault in this situation?
22. Who funded this whole scheme and situation?
23. Where the funds came from?
24. Where the funds where? Who received the funds?
25. Was this legal scheme?

26. Is the current situation or crisis or breaking news is there to cover something bigger behind? Like trying to pass new laws or corruption or purchase which are illegal. What are these things that been tried to hid behind big news. Research everything?
27. Who losing the most in this situation?
28. Who is losing least in this situation?
29. Who is winning the most in this situation
30. Who is the winning least in this situation?
31. Does the person tried to incorrectly paraphrase the arguments or facts or evidence?
32. Is there conflict of interest between these two parties?
33. Who is the breaking conflict of interest?
34. Was there are any Break a law, code of, GDPR?
35. Was there any hidden in the accounting? What was hidden? What was tried to be hidden? Why was hidden?
36. What or who the person tried to protect?
37. Was there any motivation behind some of the actions?
38. What was the motivation behind these actions?
39. What are the mathematical formulas behind?
40. What are the flow chart of decision. What would be outcome if they would decide one way or the other?
41. Was the person who speaking, presenting, author, researcher representing other side correctly and honestly?
42. Was the speaker, presenter, author and researcher were paid by somebody to do the propaganda and throw the dirt on other people?
43. Was there any propaganda used in the speech, research, book or article so that they/ he/ she advising about other side incorrectly?
44. Did I use evidence, facts and sources for every argument, premise, conclusion and sentence?
45. Did the other side used sources, facts, evidence for every sentence, premise, argument and conclusion?
46. Did the analogies are correct?
47. Did the analogies really represent other side or my side?
48. What type of arguments presented by other side?

49. Was other side used epithets about other side? Was this is logical fallacy? Did I use the epithets? Did the other side understand this epithets? Why did they think this was appropriate way or time to say this? Was this what other person think? Was this objectively true or not? Was this breaking any law?
 50. Does the other side understand the definition of this term?
 51. Was this is a troll who is not looking to get the correct information, but troll others and me?
 52. Is this person looking appropriate discussion?
 53. Is this person trying to persuade you appropriately with full information which is correct or incorrect?
 54. Would you apologise if provided facts and evidence were wrong for the arguments which were lead to wrong conclusion?
 55. Does the person know or understand that he/she/they are wrong or right?
 56. Why they they think they are right?
 57. Why they think they are wrong?
 58. How do we know that this happened exactly the way he said? Do we have facts? Evidence?
 59. Use **What, who, why, when, where, how, do , did, can, may do not, did not, cannot may not, might, might not, does, does not.**
 60. Does the person has the education to speak about this subject?
 61. Does the person has honestly went through the criticism of the opposing ideas? Did the person found the reason he opposing to the other person?
 62. Does the person have serious intention to confuse audience?
 63. How well does the person do the job to confuse the audience?
 64. Did the person introduced new terms or arguments?
 65. Did the other person did a good job to research his her ideas and opposing person ideas?
 66. What is the reason the person trying to confuse audience?
 67. What propaganda tools did the author, speaker, writer used in analysing this idea and opposing person idea?
 68. Did the person understood or understand that he used propaganda tools.
- What sources did the other person used in analysing opposing person arguments.

